Additionally, Faulkner refers to events which happen after the video reaches the central station -- not events which occur prior to the video reaching the central station.

A claimed invention is unpatentable as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 if the differences between it and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art. *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 57 USPQ2d 1161, 1165 (Fed. Cir. 2000). In making this determination, the Examiner must carefully avoid the "tempting but forbidden zone of hindsight" in which "that which only the inventor taught is used against its teacher." *In re Dembiczak*, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1616-1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Since Faulkner does not address the issues of limited bandwidth and solutions thereof that are taught by the present invention, claims 1-17 should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and are proposed to be allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant has properly and fully addressed each of the Examiner's grounds for rejection. Applicant submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes further discussion will aid examination and advance prosecution of the application, a telephone call to the undersigned is invited.

Respectfully submitted,

17 April 2006

Steven M. Bertone
Reg. No. 39,518

PRESTON GATES & ELLIS, LLP
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, WA 99201
Telephone: (509) 624-2100
Facsimile: (509) 456-0146

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on this 17th day of April, 2006.

STEVEN M. BERTONE

17 April 2006

Steven M. Bertone